

My home State of New Jersey realized this a few years ago and set about enacting policies designed to spur the growth of its solar market. The results have been extremely successful. New Jersey has the second largest solar market in the entire Nation, from 6 installations to nearly 2,000 in just 5 years, over 7 megawatts of installed capacity, and tens of millions of kilowatt-hours produced each year. New Jersey, of course, is blessed with many things, but it is not blessed with more Sun than most of the rest of the Nation. The State simply recognized that by being visionary we could not only start generating large amounts of pollution-free energy in our own State, but we could also provide a kick-start to a whole new industry. That industry, of course, generates not only great energy, truly clean energy, truly renewable energy, but at the same time creates a very significant economic positive consequence as well.

What New Jersey has done we must do as a nation. The renewable portfolio standard amendment, along with the extension of solar tax credits, will help expand the use of solar energy, and, most importantly, lower the cost.

I also want to urge my colleagues to oppose the Domenici amendment—the amendment that Senator DOMENICI has offered to Senator BINGAMAN's renewable portfolio standard amendment. That amendment would stall the development of renewable energy and thereby undercut the entire point of this bill. There are some who don't want to challenge the industry. There are those who don't want to bring us to a higher standard. For them, the Domenici amendment to Senator BINGAMAN's renewable portfolio standard is their out. That is their out.

For those Members of the Senate who don't want to bring us to a higher challenge, who don't want to challenge the industry, who, in essence, are happy to support the status quo, the Domenici amendment is their solution.

The Domenici amendment, however, has numerous problems. To begin with, the substitute would allow States to opt out of the standard for just about any reason—just about any reason. If a State can opt out, the renewable industries will be hesitant to adequately invest in these projects and, therefore, we won't move forward.

The substitute will also weaken renewable requirements by including nonrenewables, such as nuclear power. This would divert money from renewables to an already well-subsidized energy source.

The Domenici substitute would also allow the Department of Energy to designate "other clean energy sources" to qualify for clean energy credits without any restrictions on the Secretary—without any restrictions on the Secretary. Who knows what would be included under such a definition. This would leave discretion for the Secretary to include "clean coal" or any other source of energy one could put the word "clean" in front of.

In addition, the Republican substitute would include energy inefficiency projects and demand-response programs. The more things we add to the standard, the less meaningful the standard becomes. We cannot pit efficiency against renewables. We need both efficiency and renewables to flourish in partnership and not compete for investment dollars.

Once again, I praise Senator BINGAMAN, the chair of the Energy Committee, on which I have the privilege of sitting, for his amendment, for his vision, for bringing us and challenging us to a higher standard, one that the Nation clearly needs. It will be beneficial for our environment, it will boost our domestic economy, and it will reinforce the actions taken by 23 States that have already shown leadership by instituting renewable portfolio standards. If the States have already shown leadership in this regard, the Nation and the Senate need to show the same leadership.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of that important amendment and against efforts to weaken this important provision. Those are, I hope, words that Members of the Senate will take to heart.

#### TRIBUTE TO PETER CHASE NEUMANN

Mr. REID. Madam President, today I rise to honor the achievements of Peter Chase Neumann. Not only is Peter recognized locally and nationally for his skill as a trial lawyer, he is also deeply involved with philanthropies whose work has been enormously beneficial to Nevada. These significant contributions have resulted in Peter being named the recipient of the Nevada Trial Lawyers Association Lifetime Achievement Award, and deservedly so.

Peter has tried more than 150 civil and criminal cases to verdict and almost 50 appeals to the Nevada and Arizona Supreme Courts. His ability in the legal profession is renowned, and his talents are wide-ranging, from trial advocacy in personal injury cases to writing academic articles. He has dedicated himself to the cause of justice for the wrongfully injured, and has been recognized for his work in *Town and Country Magazine's* Top Trial Lawyers in America, in *Las Vegas Magazine*, by *Top Gun Lawyers* in Nevada and by *The Best Lawyers* in America.

His leadership in the legal community is unparalleled: He has served as president of the Arizona, Nevada, and Western Trial Lawyers Association, and on the Board of Governors for the American Trial Lawyers Association. He was both legislative advocate for and president of the Plaintiff's Bar, and was accepted as a diplomat in the International Society of Barristers and the American Board of Trial Advocates.

His devotion to the law has not in any way impeded his philanthropic contributions. He and his wife Renate

have served with the Angel Kiss Foundation, a nonprofit dedicated to helping families cope with the financial burdens associated with childhood cancer. President Clinton recognized Peter's influence and appointed him to the Tahoe Regional Planning Committee. He has involved himself with Scenic America and Scenic Nevada, committing himself to the cause of protecting Nevada's natural treasures in the Lake Tahoe region and beyond.

Peter is also an accomplished airplane pilot. In recent years, he has spent untold hours soaring in his gliders all over America.

Most people know Peter for his reputation as a renowned trial lawyer or for his work in the philanthropic community in my State. But I have had the privilege to call Peter my friend. It is my great pleasure to offer congratulations to Peter Chase Neumann for his lifetime of excellence in his profession, in his public service, and in his philanthropy.

#### HEALTH CARE REFORM

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, with the cost of health care continually increasing for employers, individuals, and the Government combined with the growing number of uninsured Americans it is clear that our health care system is in dire need of change. My goal is to help every American have access to affordable health insurance and to continue the State Children's Health Insurance Program, SCHIP.

In an op-ed in *The Hill* on June 6, 2007, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Mike Leavitt, suggested a very good proposal for increasing access to health insurance. His proposal calls for reauthorization of SCHIP and keeping the program's focus on kids, providing the same tax advantage to all Americans through a standard deduction for health insurance, and encouraging State innovation through grants to help low income individuals afford private health insurance.

I support Secretary Leavitt's ideas. However, health care reform is too big of an issue for one party to tackle on its own. Our only chance of achieving true, meaningful reform is if both parties work together. This involves reaching across the aisle and getting Democrats to say two words "private markets" and Republicans to say two words "universal access."

Two of my colleagues have put forward two different but thoughtful pieces of legislation addressing the uninsured Senator WYDEN's Healthy Americans Act, S. 334, and Senator COBURN's Universal Health Care Choice and Access Act, S. 1019. But I am doing something that I rarely do cosponsoring both of them to encourage my goal of affordable health insurance for every American while continuing the SCHIP program helping children.

I have cosponsored these bills in the spirit of reform, but that does not mean I support every provision in both